A Study of Variability in the Written Output of Japanese Learners of English

Nicholas Jungheim

本稿は，日本の英語学習者（大学一年生）の作文を，「中間言語」(interlanguage)として分析し，そのなかの諸「可変性」(variability) の特徴，および原因を，分析・検討したものである。「可変性」は，体系的なものと，非体系的なものとの二種類に大きく分けられる。一方，多くの英語学習者にとって，口語よりも文語における英語力の獲得の方が重要だといわれており，このことは，日本人学習者にも当てはまると思われる。そこで，学生に二つの異なった環境で英作文をしてもらい，それらのテキストにおけるそれぞれの「可変性」の形跡を，次の観点から探ってみた。即ち，言語の有標性，インプット，ディスコース機能，等である。さらにその分析において，１）全体のデータは個人のものより「可変性」の存在をよく示すかどうか，２）二種類のテキスト間に，「可変性」の差異がみられるかどうかということを検討した。

結論として，全体のデータにおいて，対象とした学習者全員に共通の「可変性」があるということがわかった。

Introduction

The language learner exhibits numerous changes in the language he uses as he progresses along the road which ideally approaches native-like competency. Corder (1967) has referred to the learner's ability along this road as transitional competence and the learner's language itself as an idiosyncratic dialect (Corder 1971a). Thus, it has all of the characteristics of a dialect such as regularity, systematicity, meaning.

As an approximative system (Nemser 1971), the learner's language in transition is typified by successive stages of proficiency. Nemser (1971) points out how these systems vary according to proficiency level as well as in terms of variation introduced by the learning experience, communication function, personal learning characteristics, and so on. Corder (1976) summarizes the sources which account for variability in a similar way as arising from the learner's situation: the learner's age, the setting, formal or informal, and the language involved.

With the introduction of the term interlanguage (IL) by Selinker (1972), we now have an all-encompassing term to describe the learner's language, the inherent transitional competence, and its nature as an approximative system.

As Ellis (1986) points out, a fundamental principle of interlanguage theory is that the learner's language is systematic. Corder (1967) speaks of this systematicity in terms of competence and performance. There will be errors of performance which can be viewed as mere "slips of the tongue" which he considers unsystematic and errors which reflect the learner's competence which represent the systematic nature of the learner's language or his underlying knowledge of the language at any given time. In other words, this systematic vs unsystematic

distinction parallels the difference between error and mistake, errors relating to competence and mistakes relating to performance.

Since it is only possible to view IL in terms of data gotten from the learner's performance, it is necessary to have a model which will account for this type of variability.

Ellis (1986) outlines IL variability under two major headings, systematic and non-systematic. Systematic variability covers much of the same territory as already stated above in relation to Nemser (1971) and Corder (1976). This is divided into individual variability which is a product of individual learner factors and contextual variability which is further subdivided into linguistic context and situational context.

Corder's (1967) performance errors are only one category of Ellis' (1986) non-systematic variability. We are not interested in this performance variability, since as already stated, it is little more than the "slip of a tongue" and tells us nothing about how acquisition takes place (p. 76).

The other category of non-systematic variability is free variability. Ellis (1986) describes free variability as the learner's possesion of more than one form or competing rules to express the same meaning. This arises from form-function relationships so that a learner may first internalize a particular form along the IL continuum but still not know how it is supposed to function in the target language.

Progress toward the achievement of native-like competency is noted in this variability. On the systematic side, the learner extends the contextual range of the forms being acquired, and on the non-systematic side, the learner resolves free variability by clarifying form-function relationships (Ellis 1986, p. 85).

How we view variability in IL depends for the most part on the type of data involved. Tarone (1979, 1985) cited Labov's "0bserver's Paradox" in describing the difficulty of obtaining unattended speech, the so-called vernacular, which is the most systematic and calls upon the researcher to clearly describe the type of data being collected and the circumstances under which this was carried out. Therefore, IL data for any given task can only be viewed in light of the nature of the task itself.

Tarone (1983) represents this task variability as a continuum from the vernacular or unattended speech to careful style which is highly monitored and thus involves much grammatical judgment. The natural or vernacular style is the most systematic and the monitored careful style is the least systematic. Tarone, however, considers each style to represent competence in that style rather than performance in opposition to Corder's performance/mistake viewpoint.

Hatch (1984), on the other hand, notes that comprehension and production of written discourse are more important than oral-discourse skills for many second language learners. Since this is where the most emphasis is put in English language education in Japan, it is in such a context that I would like to examine the IL output of the Japanese learner.

It can be expected that language learners with similar language-learning backgrounds will manifest similar IL features at any given time for any given task. In the following analysis, the written output of a group of Japanese university freshmen elicited in two tasks will be examined for signs of systematic and non-systematic variability. Although the tasks themselves do res-

trict what can be said about Japanese learner IL systematicity, I feel that as a preliminary study there are some lessons which can be learned about this particular population.

A number of questions will be addressed upon analyzing this data. First, does the written output of this population of Japanese university freshmen collectively exhibit features of IL variability for which the individual subject's data would not be sufficient to describe? Second, are the two tasks utilized here sufficiently different to discriminate variability across tasks? Thus, it is hoped that an analysis of this population as a whole will make up for the lower apparent degree of systematicity in the individual data from the written elicitation tasks.

Method

This study involves the written output of ten 19- and 20-year-old male Japanese university freshmen in a reading comprehension class of 39 students. As a homogeneous group of university students with comparable EFL backgrounds in middle school and high school curriculums determined by the Japanese Ministry of Education, it is assumed that their ILs fall within a close enough range to provide valuable data representative of aspects of variability of the IL of their small population.

Two tasks were employed for the elicitation of written data collected on two occasions separated by a period of approximately two months. As written tasks, the variability which they exhibit is expected to lean toward the less systematic careful style and of Tarone's (1983) IL stylistic continuum rather than the preferred vernacular and most systematic. The nature of the tasks, however, does put enough distance between them and the careful, "monitored" style to show systematic variability both individually and contextually as I will explain below.

In the first task the class including the subjects was asked to retell a story narrated by the teacher about his own personal experience. From past experience, such stories are more motivating, elicit greater attention, and provide the learners with good comprehensible input. The original text of this narration as well as the data elicited from the ten subjects for both tasks can be found in the appendix.

The narration was followed by the retelling of the story with pictures and unknown vocabulary put on the blackboard and comprehension checks made to assure that the class fully understood the content of the story. The class was then allowed to work in pairs so that they would depend on each other to clarify meaning and minimize the use of formulaic expressions and dictionary-based translation.

In principle the modeled data should be processed by the subjects and reappear according to their own IL systems with their inherent variability. The concentration on meaning as emphasized in the directions given to the subjects for the task puts the output closer to the vernacular end of the stylistic continuum, although it is still by nature attended output.

The second task provided a chance for more monitoring and grammatical judgments rather than a reliance on input since the subjects were assigned the task in advance and permitted to prepare it for reproduction from memory on a given occassion which was the final examination.

Prior to assigning the task the students had read a passage about the history of computers and their many uses in class. They were then instructed to prepare a short essay on the topic

of "Using Computers." They were encouraged to write about their personal experience and told that they would be evaluated for content rather than correctness in an attempt to elicit less monitored data.

It was also emphasized that the task was not to be graded as part of the test but would be considered as a "bonus" if they made a cohesive statement. It was hoped that this would provide the subjects with some motivation to express themselves.

Results

Following the Celce-Murcia and Hawkins (1985) outline of IL analysis, I will analyze some of the sources of variation in the results of the two tasks in terms of possible universals, markedness, transfer, and input, as well as discourse function following Jorden's (1983) example. In short, I will look for manifestations of the subjects' ILs and try to explain their sources and how they fit into the scheme of variability.

A simple comparison of the output from the two elicitation tasks indicates that there is systematic variability related to the situational context or task.

In Task 1, there are a great deal of syntactic and lexical forms used due most likely to the input of the elicitation task itself. However, when the subjects created their own sentences, there was a tendency to limit the sentence structure to simple SVO and SVC forms. Here was one notable source of variability which was manifested by an overgeneralization of these structures by some of the subjects. Without the modeled input as in Task 1 the subjects as a whole also show a great deal of non-systematic variability in their use of prepositions.

Gass (1984) points out that there are absolute and statistical universals which can be used to account for IL aspects which can be found in neither the native language (NL) nor the target language (TL). There is systematic variability in Task 1 which may be attributed to such a concept. Various examples on the same theme can be found among the subjects (all examples are followed by task number, subject number, and line number). These include:

(1) *She was playing plastic hole her finger. (T1 S2:14)

(2) *She plays plastic ornament of bunk bed. (T1 S6:4)

(3) *And she was playing the plastic ornament. (T1 S7:7)

(4) *Rosemarie was playing Bunk Bed's plastic ornament. (T1 S8:6)

(5) *His daughter is playing a ornament. (T1 S1 :10)

Here the subjects appear to have a variable rule in Task 1 in which the V + Prt + NP combination of the phrasal verb *play with,* which was modeled in the original story as the wh-question

(6) What was she playing with? (T1 model:-10-11), becomes verb +Ø+ NP

It could also a form in free variation applying the function of something like *play baseball,* which does not require the particle, to the above form. Without similar forms in the data, however, the case for this is weak.

For this particular verb, therefore, the learners' variable rule is one which can be found in neither the TL nor the NL and therefore could be attributed to the transfer of a universal in describing the communication of this particular meaning.

In Japanese the same meaning could be communicated with:

(7) ROOZUMARI GA OMOCHA *DE* ASOBU.
Rosemarie plays with a toy.

Thus, in spite of the difference between the SVO structure of English versus the SOV structure of Japanese, we still find that a particle is required in Japanese, in this case the preverbal particle DE.

On the other hand, there are other examples of *play* in the data which on the surface seem to contradict the existence of a systematic variable rule in this data. We can also find:

(8) Rosemarie was playing on the floor. (T1 S4:8)

Eight of the ten subjects produced sentences similar to (8) or some close variation which differed mainly in tense or aspect. Only one subject omitted the particle in

(9) *Rosemare playing floor. (T1 S1:7)

(8) might be considered as free variation in which two forms for the same function coexist in the learner's IL. This, however, is an overly simplistic description of the variability in this case. In (8) *play* is followed by the locative, whereas in (1)—(5) it is followed by the theme (Celce-Murcia, Larsen-Freeman 1983, p. 6). This is important becouse sentences which include the locative are well formed, unlike those in which *play* is followed by the theme.

Rather than indicating a structure in free variation, these examples more likely represent the contrast between the systematic variation of the V +Ø variable rule in the learners' IL for the V + Prt rule of English when *play* is followed by a theme and the locative *on the floor* as a chunk of unanalyzed language which could eventually be analyzed and applied to the previous case.

In the highly monitored second task, there are few examples of phrasal verbs to compare how the use of this type of structure varies according to task, but there is the example of:

(10) *...I don't play to famicon. . . (T2 S3:1)

which may support the concept of lower systematicity in highly monitored tasks (Tarone 1983). Monitoring tells the learner that a particle is needed but there is no rule to indicate the correct one, thus the apparent random application of *to* in this case. Of course, more data under similar monitored conditions would be needed to confirm this.

Monitoring in Task 2 also results in the insertion of particles where they are not needed, such as

(11) *I using to TV or radio. . . . (T2 S3:1)

(12) *Computer is using to all of the education. . . . (T2 S8:1)

(13) *We study by use to computer. (T2 S3:2)

Here the learners appear to be inferring function from form by overgeneralizing *use* + *to* which indicates habitual acts which have been discontinued for the basic function of the verb *use*. These are just the kinds of errors which might be expected for structures in free variation, however, this is most likely the result of defective monitoring considering the nature of the task itself.

In a less attended situation, though, (11) — (13) would be good examples of the Transfer to Somewhere (TSS) principle (Andersen 1983) which states that

> A grammatical form or structure will occur consistently and to a significant extent in interlanguage as a result of transfer *if and only if* (Andersen's emphasis) there already exists within the L2 input the potential for (mis-) generalization from the input to produce the same form or structure. (p. 178)

Another aspect of the subjects' IL variability is their variable rule for the use of adjective participles derived from "emotive" verbs. This is a feature which appears frequently in Japanese-English ILs and, indeed, for many non-native speakers (Celce-Murcia Larsen-Freeman 1983, p. 451)

Data for the story retelling tasks includes such example as:

(14) *Doctor was surprised. (T1 2:20)

which closely mirrors the original,

(15) He was surprised. (T1 model:21)

These subjects do not, however, misapply the -Ing participle which is most commonly done but instead appear to have a variable rule which treats the participle as the emotive verb from which it comes, which once more follows the TTS principle. Thus, we can see

(16) *Doctor supprised. (T1 S6:7)

(17) *Mr. Jungheim was suprrise. (T10 S10:12)

(18) *The docter was spprise. (T10 S10:14)

The lack the copula in (16) and the use of BE + past tense while dropping the -ed from the participle in (17) and (18) to avoid what the learner sees as double marking for tense support this.

Monitoring may account for this once again, since there is a greater opportunity to attend to structure in this task.

Then too, in the second elicitation task, there is a similar example,

(19) *I don't interested in. . . .(T2 S3:1-2)

The use of DO support for the negative is a strong indication that the participle is being treated as the verb from which it comes.

Further evidence of monitoring inherent in the second task is provided by S10 who produced examples (17) and (18) above.

(20) *I am absorbed in pasocon. (T2 S10:3)

(21) *And I am absorbed in Family computer. (T2 S10:6)

While the -ed participle appears to be well-formed unlike the subject's Task 1 output, the language itself is not native-like. In a similar situation Japanese speakers will usually use the word MUCHUU in Japanese to indicate their degree of interest in some activity. Simply checking the typical Japanese-English dictionary will net the definition "be absorbed in," once again showing how the amount of attention to form will result in variation which differs according to IL style. Certainly dictionary use could be considered super monitoring.

Discourse functions are another subject which provides an interesting area of inquiry on the origins of variable rules in interlanguage. While we do not find examples of the transfer of the Japanese SOV sentence structure in any of the data, there are examples of systematic variation which can be attributed to the concept of topicality in Japanese discourse.

Jordens, (1983), in his study of case-marking errors of Dutch learners of German, found that

their incorrect marking of NPs for case was not a result of word order but instead was the result of their L1-based intuition about a discourse-based subject function as opposed to a grammatical subject function (p. 353).

He cites Schacter's (1977) conclusions on discourse-functional properties of topicality as being inherent in the subject in English. Schacter and Rutherford (1979) give examples of such errors made by Japanese and Chinese learners of English of which the following appears to have been made by a Japanese learner:

(22) *Irrational emotions are bad but rational emotions must use for judging. (Schacter and Rutherford 1979, p. 309)

This had been taken as the confusion between active and passive voice, but Schacter and Rutherford concluded that it was a result of the topic/comment structures of Chinese and Japanese.

In the first elicitation task in this study, the original story contained the sentence:

(23) She put it on her finger like a ring (T1 model:16).

After processing by the subjects, the resulting sentences included:

(24) *...Rosemarie plastic bunk bed put the hole her finger. (T1 S1:8-9)

(25) *She's finger put in hole. (T1 S3:10)

(26) *The plastic ornament put on Rosemarie's finger. . . . (T1 S4:8)

(27) *She was playing plastic ornament hole's put in her finger. . . (T1 S8:6-7)

(28) *Then, her finger didn't put out. (T1 S8:8)

(29) *Mr. Jungheim take in. . . kitchen and her hand wash sope. (T1 S2:17)

In examples (24)—(28), the topic referring to either the finger or the bed ornament intervenes between the agent she or Rosemarie. This does make it appear that the auxiliary verb BE has been omitted and that it is just an error in the passive. However, (28) uses DO support to hold the negative which indicates the contrary and supports the topic/comment conclusions of Schacter and Rutherford (1979). In other words the topic has been put in the subject position, the only difference being whether the learner chose the finger or the ornament as the topic.

Example (29) is similar. The agent, Mr. Jungheim is clearly indicated in the sentence, but it is replaced by the topic *her hand* in the subject position for the verb *wash*. Thus, there is systematic variation in this task which can be accounted for by a variable rule transferred from the learners' L1, that is, transfer of the Japanese topic/comment structure. Whether or not this holds true for other verbs and if certain verbs and topics are more prone to be treated according to Japanese discourse functions is a good topic for further study. No such forms were found in the more monitored task which supports their systematicity in the first task in which there was greater attention to meaning.

Conclusion

The number of similar IL examples exhibited by these subjects indicates that they do indeed have some shared systematic variability as well as possible free variation. There does seem to be support for task variability as shown by the most obvious examples of monitoring in the more careful style of Task 2.

However, since this is a descriptive study using a small number of subjects arbitrarily chosen from a particular population on the basis of the content and quality of their output from narrowly defined tasks, the overall applicability of the data is limited. The homogeneity of this population, though, does lend support to the meaningfulness of this data in its own right. The data also shows that population variability can give us some insights into individual variability.

As Tarone (1979) warns us, it is difficult to collect systematic IL data due to the inherent ambiguities of the collection process itself. However, in studying a particular population such as these Japanese college students, it must be remembered that the collection of spoken data from a large sampling approaching the vernacular is even more difficult due to their backgrounds in the grammar-translation study of English and affective variables.

Since many learners may never use their language skills in anything but a highly monitored situation, it is still important that we study ILs in such styles to gain insights for pedagogical application.

As Corder (1971b) states:

> In order to make progress in the methods and materials of teaching we need to be able to relate the materials and procedures used by the teachers to changes in the knowledge of the learner. (p. 34)

How else can we better study such changes or variability if not across the whole continuum of IL styles in spite of the problems involved in sorting out "slips of the pen" from true indications of the learner's IL.

A larger data pool gathered over longer period and spread more evenly toward both ends of the stylistic continuum should provide clearer indications of implications for pedagogy in Japan where the four skills are often taught in isolation.

Bibliography

Andersen, R. 1983. Transfer to somewhere. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (eds.), *Language Transfer in Language Learning.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Celce-Murcia, M. and D. Larsen-Freeman. 1983. *The Grammar Book.* Rowley Mass.: Newbury House.

Corder, S. P. 1967. The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics.* V : No. 4. reprinted in Corder 1981.

Corder, S. P. 1971a. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics.* IX : No. 2. reprinted in Corder 1981.

Corder, S. P. 1971b. Describing the language learner's language. *CILT Reports and Papers.* No. 6. reprinted in Corder 1981.

Corder, S. P. 1976. The study of interlanguage, *Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics.* Vol. 2. reprinted in Corder 1981.

Corder, S. P. 1981. *Error Analysis and Interlanguge.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. 1984. As discussant on the nature of scientific enquiry in interlanguage research. In A. Davies and C. Criper (eds.). *Interlanguage: Proceedings of the Seminar in Honour of Pit Corder.* Edinburgh:

Edinburgh University Press.

Ellis, R. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. 1984. A review of interlanguage syntax: language transfer and language universals. *Language Learning,* 34: 115-132.

Hatch, E. 1984. Theoretical review of discourse and interlanguage. In A. Davies and C. Criper (eds.). *Interlanguage: Proceedings of the Seminar in Honour of Pit Corder.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jordens, P. 1983. Discourse functions in interlanguage morphology. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (eds.). *Language Transfer in Language Learning.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Nemser, W. 1971. Approximative systems of foreign language learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* IX : 115-123.

Schacter, J. and W. Rutherford. 1979. Discourse function and language transfer. *Working Papers on Bilingualism.* 19:3-12, reprinted in B. W. Robinett and J. Schacter (eds). 1983. *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schacter, P. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In P. Cole and J. Sadock (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics.* vol. 8, Grammatical Relations, New York. Academic Press.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* X : 209-231.

Tarone, E. 1979. Interlanguage as chameleon. *Language Learning.* 29: 181-191.

Tarone, E. 1983. On the variability of interlanguage systems. *Applied Linguistics.* 4/2 : 143-163.

Tarone, E. 1985. Variability in interlanguage use: a study of style-shifting in morphology and syntax. *Language Learning.* 35 : 373-395.

Appendix

Data*

The Original Story —— "My Amazing Experience"

Today I will tell you about an amazing experience I had last year with my family here in Japan.

First, let me tell you about my family. There are four of us. My wife Maki, who is from Toyama Prefecture, my son Luke who is four years old, and my daughter Rosemarie, who is two.

One Saturday morning last year we were relaxing at home. My son was not there because he went to nursery school. My wife and I were reading newspapers. Little Rosemarie was playing on the floor. What was she playing with? It was the ornament from her bed.

* All data was transcribed by following the original orthographic arrangements of the subjects for paragraphing, etc. as closely as possible including extraneous marks and insertions.

It was a small plastic cap with a hole in it. It should have been on the post of the children's bed but it came off very easily.

What do you think Rosemarie was doing with the ornament? She put it on her finger like a ring. After a long time, she still had it on her finger. I tried to take it off. It was stuck. I put soap on it but that didn't help slip it off.

So, I took Rose to the doctor to get his help. What did the doctor say? He was surprised. He said I should have gone to a hardware store for a tool to cut it off. He decided to call the fire department. We waited.

Suddenly there were many sirens. Not only did an ambulance come, but two fire trucks and twenty firemen came. . . just to take this plastic ornament off of Rosemarie's finger.

Two men held Rosemarie while one man tried to cut the ornament off with a small saw. Rosemarie started to cry. I thought they would cut her finger off. Many people were watching outside. Finally, the fireman cut through the plastic and pulled the ornament off. We all breathed sighs of relief.

Task 1

Subject 1

My teacher, Maki, Ruke,
Rosemare,
day, last year saturday in summer.
pleace. Toyama けん, at home.
Ruke go to nursery school, no home.
Jungheime and wife reading a
newspaper. Rosemare playing floor.
Afer, Rosemare plastic bunk bed
put the hole her finger
,Her finger swollen.
Go to doctor house, doctor said
"Oh, I can't it. Call the firemen,,

Subject 2

Mr. Jungheim family is his wife. son.

2 and daughter.
3 His wife name is Maki. She is from
4 Toyama.
5 His son name is Luke. He is five
6 years old and his daughter name is
7 Rosemarie. She is two years old.
8 One Saturday Mr. Luke go to Nursery School
9 He is not at home.
10 ~~One Saturday~~ Mr. Jungheim and his wife were
11 reading newspaper. Rosemarie was playing
12 on the ~~flower~~ She was playing plastic
13 from the bunk bed
14 She was playing plastic hole her finger
15 Then ~~sh~~ her finger not plastic.
16 Mr. Jungheim take in the kict kitchen.
17 and her hand wash sope (?) (ソープ).
18 But ~~fi~~ plastic was not her finger.
19 Next Mr. Jungheim took on the doctor's
20 office Doctor was surprised.
21 Doctor said "I can't help you,,
22 Mr. Jungheim went to the hardware store and
23 bu buy a cuter. Cuter was not.
24 And then he telephon

Subject 3
1 Last year on Summer, Saterday morning.
2 Jungheims family is four.
3 His wife name is Maki.
4 His son name is Luke. He is five years old now.
5 His daughter name is Rosemarie. She is two years old.
6 Mr. Jungheims was reading newspaper.
7 His wife was reading newspaper too.
8 Rosemarie is playing on the floor.
9 She took plastic ornament from Bunk bed.
10 She's finger put in the hole.
11 After one hour.

Subject 4
1 Jungheims' story.
2 My family is four. My wife is Maki. My son Luke.
3 My daughter is Rosemarie. Luke is five years old.

4 Rosemarie is two years old. Luke was going to nursery school.
5 An Amaying Store. last summer.
6 Jungheim and Maki was reading newspaper in the house
7 Rosemarie was playing on the floor.
8 The plastic ornament put on Rosemarie's finger
9 for one hour.

Subject 5

1 This story was in 1985. Now, my teacher is
2 37 years old. His name is Jungheim. His wife is
3 Japanese. She came from Toyama Pref. They have
4 two children. His son is five years old whose name is
5 Luke. And his daughter is two years old whose
6 name is Rosemarie. She is cute and pretty.
7 One saturday morning, Jungheim and Maki was
8 reading newspaper. Luke went to nursery school.
9 Rosemarie was playing on the floor. And then, she put
10 a plastic ornament of bunk bed to her finger.
11 One hour past, her finger was swollen. Jungheim
12 went to kitchen and brought a soap.

Subject 6

1 In last year's summer, Luke is 4 years old. Rosemariy is one years old
2 One day One saturday Jungheim and his wife Maki read newspaper
3 Rosemarie plays on the floor. ~~She plays bunk bed of~~
4 She plays plastic ornament of bunk bed.
5 She plays one hour. Her finger ~~is~~ was swollen.
6 Jungheim try put off by soup.
7 Jungheim go to doctor office. Doctor supprised.
8 buy cutter in hardware store.

Subject 7

1 Mr. Jungheim's wife is Maki.
2 His son's name is Luke. He is five years old, now.
3 His daughter's name is Rosemarie. She is two years old, now.
4 Last years in summer he and his wife read newspaper.
5 Luke went to nursery school.
6 Rosemarie was playing on the floor.
7 And she was playing the plastic ornament.
8 Then her finger.

Subject 8

Once upon a time on Saturday Jungheim's family was happening.
Jungheim, his wife and his daughter was at home. Mr. Jungheim have two
children. Two children is Luke and Rosemarie. Luke is five years old.
and Rosemarie is two years old. Luke was going to nursary school. Mr.
Jungheim and his wife was reading a newspaper. Rosemarie was playing on the
floor. Rosemarie was playing Bunk Bed's plastic ornament. She was playing
plastic ornament hole's put in her finger in one hour. Her finger swollened.
Then, her finger didn't put out.

Subject 9

This story was last year's story.
A family staff is four.
Mr. Jungheim is father whose wife's under name
is Maki.
Mr. Jungheim have two children.
One is son. Another is daugter.
He is five old now. Her is two old now.
Sister's name is Rose Marie.
When she was one, the thing was happend.
Parents was reading the newspaper.
Rose Marie was playing on the floor.
And she was playing on the plastic ornament
of bunk bed. Then when after for a while,
she was crying. Father and mother came to
bed. She was rocking her finger by the hole
of bunk bed. Then her mother go to kitchen,
and bring a soap. But this activity was wast time
Father was called.
Then two track and twenty finermans came to
his home.
Two fireman pulled the hole of the bed and
one fireman catched rose Mary.
Rose marie was crying and crying.
Then Rose Mary's finger was safe.
Her parents was smiled.

Subject 10

He wife is maki. she came from Toyama
he is loving her.
He son is Luke. he is five years ago.

4 he speak Japanese and English.
5 His daughter is Rosemarri she is two years ago.
6 She speak Japanese and English too.
7 One day (Sta day) Mr. Jungheim is reading a
8 newspeper. his wife is reading a newspeper too.
9 Luke was NurserryShcool.
10 His daughter is playing a ornament
11 then finger hold swohen.
12 Mr. Jungheim was suprrise.
13 He take docter office with his daughter.
14 The docter was spprise. the men is nothing
15 to do.
16 then he teleponed by fire man.
17 then two car. and

Task 2

Instructions——Write a short essay about "Using Computers" (about 25 words).

The task followed a reading passage about the history and application of computers. The subjects had been instructed a week earlier to prepare this beforehand in relation to their own experience.

Subject 1

1 I want "Family computer". But my brother said, "Personal computer".
2 It is 10,000 Japanese yen. He works hard every day.
3 But, I think that my brother doesn't buy a Parsonal computer.

Subject 2

1 I love Tamami.
2 If computer loves human
3 It's fany.
4 Computer have not love.
5 Computer can not love.
6 I do love Tamami.

Subject 3

1 I using to TV or radio, but I don't play to famicon and machine of game.
2 I don't interested in Computers.

Subject 4

1 I like Family Computer.

2 I like Super Mariobrothers Ⅱ.
3 Tank you Mr. Yunghaim.

Subject 5
1 The Computer is a wonterful machine.
2 But I don't have a family computer.
3 It is a game.
4 Because I hate the family computer.
5 I want to go to America in this summer vacation.

Subject 6
1 I like a family-computer. That's game is very difficult.
2 That is easyer than the parsonal-computer, but it's soft is high cost.
3 Today, toy used computers.

Subject 7
1 When I may forget a lot of important information,
2 I use the computer.

Subject 8
1 Computer is using to all of the education that it is a few years in the
2 future. We won't go to school. We study by use to computer.

Subject 9
1 The computer is useful of our lives.

Subject 10
1 I have pearsonal computer. I bought it fifteen years old.
2 It is pet name "pasocon" and "MSX". "MSX" can be used for vorious purposes
3 I bought it in those day, I am absorbed in pasocon.
4 I lent my cosin my pearsonal computer. Her name is Tomoko.
5 She is fifeen years old now!
6 And I am absorbed in Family computer. Thank you for your lesson.